



IN THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Ted C. Johnson

Confirmation No.: 1212

Application No.: 09/862538

Examiner: LIM, Krishna

Filing Date: May 21, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2153

Title: Methods And Structure For Implementing Web Server Quality-Of-Service Control

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner For Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on MAR 1, 2006.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$500.00.

*(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)*

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

(X) (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:

(X) one month	\$120.00
( ) two months	\$450.00
( ) three months	\$1020.00
( ) four months	\$1590.00

( ) The extension fee has already been filled in this application.

( ) (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account **08-2025** the sum of \$620.00. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

(X) I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. Date of Deposit: JUNE 1, 2006

OR

( ) I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_

Number of pages:

Typed Name: *Eileen Lehmann*

Signature: *Eileen Lehmann*

Respectfully submitted,

*Ted C. Johnson*

By *Eileen Lehmann*

*Eileen Lehmann*

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. **39272**

Date: **JUNE 1, 2006**

Telephone No.: **650 857 7940**



HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Docket No.: 10005473-1  
(PATENT)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:  
Teddy Christian Johnson

Application No.: 09/862,538

Confirmation No.: 1212

Filed: May 21, 2001

Art Unit: 2153

For: METHODS AND STRUCTURE FOR  
IMPLEMENTING WEB SERVER QUALITY  
OF SERVICE CONTROL

Examiner: LIM, Krishna

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

06/06/2006 BABRAHA1 00000038 09862538  
01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Dear Sir:

As required under § 41.37(a), this brief is filed within two months of the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on April 19, 2005, and is in furtherance of said Notice of Appeal.

The fees required under § 41.20(b)(2) are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and M.P.E.P. § 1206:

- |       |   |  |
|-------|---|--|
| I.    | Real Party In Interest                        | 06/06/2006 BABRAHA1 00000038 002025 09862538 |
| II.   | Related Appeals and Interferences             | 01 FC:1402 500.00 DA                         |
| III.  | Status of Claims                              |  |
| IV.   | Status of Amendments                          |  |
| V.    | Summary of Claimed Subject Matter             |  |
| VI.   | Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal |  |
| VII.  | Argument                                      |  |
| VIII. | Claims  |  |

IX.	Evidence
X.	Related Proceedings
Appendix A	Claims

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is: Hewlett-Packard Development Company, a Texas Limited Liability Partnership having its principal place of business in Houston, Texas.

II. RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 17 claims pending in application.

B. Current Status of Claims

1. Claims canceled: None
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None
3. Claims pending: 1-17
4. Claims allowed: None
5. Claims rejected: 1-17

C. Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1-17.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

There are no pending amendments to the claims.

## V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

An embodiment of the present invention includes a method for providing Web services comprising a number of steps (See Figure 2, pages 7-8). A computing node (Server 120, page 6, line 9) receives a request from a Web client process wherein said request includes customer ID information (Figure 2 200, page 7, lines 11-12) and spawns (Figure 2 206, page 8 lines 6-10) a program element, an example of which is a child process. In one example, the child process can take the form of a cgi-bin process (page 8 lines 7-8). A customer ID is associated with the spawned child program element (Figure 2 208, page 8, lines 16-22). In this embodiment, resource utilization monitor programs or resource monitor 102 allocates computing resources of said computing node to the spawned program element in accordance with said customer ID information associated with said request (See Figure 2 220 through 224, page 9 line 6 to page 10, line 7. Different levels (e.g., minimum, maximum) can be allocated based on the customer ID (Page 9, lines 21-30).

Another embodiment of the present invention includes a system for delivery of services in a client/server distributed environment. Figure 1 illustrates an example of such an embodiment. (Page 6, line 9 to page 7, line 6). A web server 110 is operable as a process on a server computing node 100 to service requests from a plurality of client processes 120 coupled to the server computing node 100, in this example connected via the Internet 150. The server process spawned a plurality of server child processes operable on said server computing node (See 112 Log of Sessions) in which each child process is associated with a customer ID. A process resource manager (See 120 Session Monitor) on the server computing node controls allocation of resources of the server computing node among the plurality of server child processes in accordance with the customer ID associated with each process.

Examples of computing resources are CPU time utilization of a program element, main memory utilization and bandwidth utilization of secondary storage by the various program elements (See discussion of the system embodiment of Figure 1 at page 6, line 29 to page 7, line 6.)

## VI. GROUNDS OF OBJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-6 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 7-10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

## VII. ARGUMENT

### **35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In the Final Office Action mailed November 1, 2005 (hereinafter Final Action), the Examiner finally rejected claims 1-6 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zenner (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,330). However, Appellant respectfully submits that each of claims 1-6 and 11-16 recites limitations not taught by *Zenner*.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a reference must teach every element of the claim. *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, in order for an applied reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claim.” *See Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

### **Independent Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites the following:

A method for providing Web services comprising the steps of :  
a computing node receiving a request from a Web client process  
wherein said request includes customer ID information;  
spawning a program element operable on the computing node to  
process said request;  
associating said customer ID information with the spawned program;  
and  
allocating computing resources of said computing node to the spawned  
program element in accordance with said customer ID information associated  
with said request.

As illustrated in *its* Figure 3, *Zenner* discloses a prediction process (Col. 6, lines 7-25) for initially assigning a user request to an agent workstation based on the expected processing time of the request by that agent and provides for reassignment of the request based on predetermined criteria such as the user request has not been processed within a certain time period. (See Col. 8 lines 34-41). A user request comes in a form such as an e-mail, a form, or a recorded voice message. (Col. 6, lines 9-11). The basis of the initial assignment are based

on a number of factors (e.g., experience level of the agent, expertise level of skill set of the agent, etc. *see* Col. 6, lines 40-64) related to the agent's expected time for processing the request. "To predict which agent is most likely to finish servicing the request first, the Pre-IAWD 220 determines and uses characteristics of the request such as a priority of the request, a subject matter or topic of the request, and an average time the group of agents takes to service the request." (Col. 6, lines 27-31).

In the Final office action, the Examiner cites for support in his paragraph 15 on page 6 the following:

b) spawning (distributing) a program element (agent workstations of Fig. 2, number of available agents at a given time (col. 6) operable on a computing node to process said request (e.g., *see* Fig. 2, col. 5 (line 51) to col. 6 (line 64)).

Appellant respectfully reasserts the previously presented argument in his response of August 16, 2005 that the term "spawn" has a particular meaning in the computer science context; namely to create a child program element by another program element, i.e., the parent program element. A typical embodiment of a program element is a process, but not a workstation. For a 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection, the reference has to disclose each and every element of the claim. The description for predicting which agent, a human being or robotic response (Zenner, Col. 5, lines 63-64) is going to provide the quickest customer service based on characteristics such as the topic of the request and the experience and skill level of the agent is solving a different problem at a level of abstraction not concerned with, and moreover, not disclosing spawning a program element. *Zenner* does not disclose each and every element of claim 1; hence claim 1 is patentable over *Zenner*.

### **Independent Claim 11**

The arguments presented for claim 11 are also applicable for establishing that *Zenner* does not disclose a "means for spawning a program element operable on a computing node to process said request." *Zenner* fails to disclose the invention as recited in claim 11 as it is contained in the claim. Thus, *Zenner* does not anticipate claim 11, and Appellant respectfully requests that the Board overturn this rejection.

**Claims 2-6 and 12-16**

Claims 2–6 depend from claim 1, and claims 12-16 depend from claim 11. Thus each of claims 2–6 and 12–16 inherit all of the limitations from its respective base claim, and each of claims 2–6 and 12–16 contain limitations not taught by *Zenner*. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that *Zenner* does not anticipate claims 2–6 and 12–16 either and respectfully asks this Board to overturn the rejections.

Furthermore, *Zenner* fails to disclose “allocating a minimum level of resources to the spawned program element in accordance with said customer ID information” of claim 2 or “allocating a maximum level of resources to the spawned program element in accordance with said customer ID information.” The resources in these claims are referencing the computing resources of claim 1. *Zenner* provides a prediction scheme for *assigning* a request to a particular agent based on a variety of real world factors as described in Col. 6, lines 40-64 including the user identification, expertise and experience levels, average time for processing a request etc. However, *Zenner* is not providing a solution at the level of computing resources. It only discloses how to assign a request to an agent but not a level of computing resources for a spawned program element based on the customer ID information. The arguments with respect to claims 2 and 3 are also applicable to claims 12 and 13. In view of these additional reasons as well, the Board is respectfully requested to overturn the rejection of claims 2-3 and 12-13.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 7-10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zenner* in view of *Cherkasova et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,865,601).

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) section 2143 discusses the requirements of a *prima facie* case for obviousness:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teaching. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant’s disclosure.

**Claims 8-10, 7 and 17**

First, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine *Zenner* and *Cherkasova* to make the claimed invention. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner states:

Moreover, both of these two references are directed to the distributing of workload in the computer network. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of *Cherkasova* into *Zenner* in order to receive the Internet workload distributor that can distribute equally workload among the servers.

The two references are not directed to the distributing of workload in the computer network, nor to distributing equally workload among servers. *Cherkasova* discloses load balancing among server nodes in a server cluster. More specifically, *Cherkasova* discloses organizing web sites into groups and then assigning each group of web sites to one of the server nodes in the server cluster. *Zenner* is directed to distributing customer requests in the form of e-mails or recorded voice messages to the agents typically human beings based on non-computer implemented criteria such as the experience and skill sets of the agents and the nature of the real-world problem the customer is having as determined from the customer's request. The problems being solved are different; hence, the disclosures of *Cherkasova* and *Zenner* are describing different, quite unrelated solutions. Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art is not going to be motivated to combine these references to make the invention as claimed in claims 8-10, or claims 7 and 17 for that matter.

**Claims 8-10**

Furthermore, the resulting combination does not disclose each and every element of claims 8-10 and 7 and 17. Accordingly, *Cherkasova* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Zenner* described above with respect to Claims 1-6 and 11-16. For example, *Cherkasova* fails to disclose or suggest details regarding operations within a server node, and particularly fails to disclose or suggest

a plurality of server child processes operable on said server computing node and spawned by said server process to process said requests from said plurality

of client processes wherein each child process of said plurality of server child processes is associated with customer ID information.

Thus, independent claim 8 is patentable over *Zenner* in view of *Cherkasova*. Claims 9-10 depend from claim 8; thus, each of claims 9-10 inherit all of the limitations from its respective base claim. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that claims 8-10 are patentable over *Zenner* in view of *Cherkasova* and respectfully asks this Board to overturn the rejections.

#### **Claims 7 and 17**

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and claim 17 depends from claim 11, and each inherits all of the limitations from its respective base claim. Thus, each of claims 7 and 17 are not anticipated by *Zenner*. As noted in paragraph 12, page 4 of the Final Office Action, neither of *Zenner* or *Cherkasova* disclose that the computing resources include secondary storage bandwidth utilization. A link between a LAN 122 and the Internet 128 in Figure 1 of *Zenner* may suggest that there is in general bandwidth between networks, but would not suggest the additional feature of the claims as detailed in the claim language, namely that computing resources allocated in accordance with the customer ID information include secondary storage bandwidth utilization.

In summary there is no suggestion within the references themselves to combine them to make the claimed invention. Moreover, the combination does not disclose each and every element of claims 8-10 and 7 and 17. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that claims 7-10 and 17 are patentable over *Zenner* in view of *Cherkasova* and respectfully asks this Board to overturn the rejections.

#### **VIII. CLAIMS**

A copy of the claims involved in the present appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

#### **IX. EVIDENCE**

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the examiner is being submitted.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS

No related proceedings are referenced in II. above, or copies of decisions in related proceedings are not provided, hence no Appendix for this section is included.

Date: *June 1, 2006*

Respectfully Submitted on Behalf of Applicant~~s~~

Teddy C. Johnson

*Eileen Lehmann*

Eileen Lehmann

Registration No. 39,272

Hewlett-Packard Company

Mail Stop 1197

1501 Page Mill Road

Palo Alto, CA 94304

650-857-7940 (telephone)

650-852-8063 (fax)

**APPENDIX A**

**Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 09/862,538**

1. (Previously Presented) A method for providing Web services comprising the steps of:

a computing node receiving a request from a Web client process wherein said request includes customer ID information;

spawning a program element operable on the computing node to process said request;

associating said customer ID information with the spawned program; and

allocating computing resources of said computing node to the spawned program element in accordance with said customer ID information associated with said request.

2. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 wherein the step of allocating comprises allocating a minimum level of resources to the spawned program element in accordance with said customer ID information.

3. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 wherein the step of allocating comprises allocating a maximum level of resources to the spawned program element in accordance with said customer ID information.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein said customer ID information is encoded in a process name of each said spawned program element.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein said computing resources includes processor time utilization.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein said computing resources includes main memory utilization.

7. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein said computing resources includes secondary

storage bandwidth utilization.

8. (Original) A system for delivery of services in a client/server distributed environment comprising: a server computing node; a server process operable on said server computing node for processing requests from a plurality of client processes coupled to said server computing node; a plurality of server child processes operable on said server computing node and spawned by said server process to process said requests from said plurality of client processes wherein each child process of said plurality of server child processes is associated with customer ID information; and a process resource manager operable on said server computing node to control allocation of resources of said server computing node among said plurality of server child processes wherein said resource manager is operable to control allocation of said resources in accordance with said customer ID information associated with said each child process.

9. (Original) The system of claim 8 wherein said server process is a Web server process, and wherein said each child process is a cgi-bin process.

10. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 8 wherein said process resource monitor further comprises:

a CPU time resource monitor element for allocating CPU time to said each child process;

a secondary storage bandwidth resource monitor for allocating secondary storage bandwidth to said each child process; and

a main memory resource monitor for allocating main memory to said each child process.

11. (Original) A system for providing Web services comprising:

means for receiving a request from a Web client process wherein said request includes customer ID information;

means for spawning a program element operable on a computing node to process said request;

means for associating said customer ID information with the spawned program; and

means for allocating computing resources of said computing node to the spawned program element in accordance with said customer ID information associated with said request.

12. (Original) The system of claim 11 wherein said means for allocating comprises:

means for allocating a minimum level of resources to the spawned program element in accordance with said customer ID information.

13. (Original) The system of claim 11 wherein said means for allocating comprises:

means for allocating a maximum level of resources to the spawned program element in accordance with said customer ID information.

14. (Original) The system of claim 11 wherein said customer ID information is encoded in a process name of each said spawned program element.

15. (Original) The system of claim 11 wherein said means for allocating includes means for allocating processor time utilization.

16. (Original) The system of claim 11 wherein said means for allocating includes means for allocating main memory utilization.

17. (Original) The system of claim 11 wherein said means for allocating includes means for allocating secondary storage bandwidth utilization.